## 10194.8017.US01/CINGP113USA

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-20 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A new listing of the claims is at pages 2-5. Claims 1, 8, 15 and 17-19 have been amended. Claim 16 has been canceled.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

# I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 15 and 17-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Galipean *et al.* (US Pat. No. 6,249,913 B1). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Galipean *et al.* does not anticipate each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) Emphasis added. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claimed invention relates to an integrated communication system for distributing integrated, and combined or reformatted audio/video and other signals over aircraft telecommunications wiring. More particularly, amended claim 1 recites an integrated communication system for an aircraft having at least one passenger seat, comprising an integrated signal unit operable to receive and transmit a plurality of signals of disparate nature to and from a user of the at least one passenger seat in the aircraft; wherein the signal unit communicates the plurality of disparate signals to and from the passenger seat via a wireless link; a plurality of aircraft communication links interfaced with the integrated signal unit for carrying the plurality of signals of disparate nature throughout the aircraft from sources of the plurality of signals of disparate nature, the aircraft communications links include pre-existing aircraft telecommunications wiring;

and a receiving device interfaced to the at least one passenger seat and in communication with the integrated signal unit for receiving at least one of the plurality of signals and outputting a signal to a passenger in the at least one passenger seat. Galipeau et al. does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicant's invention as recited in the subject claims.

Galipeau et al. teaches an aircraft data management system that provides a passenger seated on the aircraft with a number of entertainment and productivity enhancing options. Such options include video, audio, internet, airplane systems data and power. Located proximate to each seat group is an integrated seat box that includes a network interface card that identifies a requesting passenger for proper directing of the required data and/or power from devices that interface with a network controller back to the requesting passenger. Both on-aircraft and off-aircraft devices may be accessed by the system. Accordingly, a seat-to-seat cable is disclosed that delivers both power and data to integrated seat boxes from a plurality of data sources and at least one power source. The seat-to-seat cable contains both data communication lines and power supply lines and transmits data and power from data sources and power sources to selected identifiable seats by way of the network controller. Among the requirements of the seatto-seat cable are that it provides a sufficiently high bandwidth to support the various functions requested by the passenger. It should support high-speed data distribution to provide real time data delivery for audio and video and telephony (See Col. 4, lines 21-31).

At Page 9 of the Office Action (dated 7-15-05), the Examiner admits that Galipeau et al. fails to teach the use of a wireless link to enable the signal unit to communicate the plurality of disparate signals to and from the passenger seat, as disclosed in the subject claims. However, the Examiner takes official notice to the fact that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a wireless link to enable the signal unit to communicate with the plurality of disparate signals. Applicant's representative respectfully traverses the aforementioned well known statements and requests that the Examiner cite a reference in support of his position pursuant to MPEP 2144.03 if the rejection of the claims is

maintained. Thus, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that the rejection for claim 1 be withdrawn, and for claims 2, 4-7 that depend therefrom.

With respect to amended claim 8, the seat unit of the aircraft communications system includes "...a second telephone signal processing circuit that is operable to receive and send the telephone signals for delivery to and from a passenger telephone handset via a wireless link,..." Galipeau et al. does not teach the use of a wireless link to enable a telephone signal processing circuit to receive and send the telephone signals to and from a passenger headset, as disclosed in the subject claims. Thus, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that the rejection for this claim be withdrawn, and for claims 9-14 that depend therefrom.

With respect to amended claim 15, the aircraft communications system includes "...an integrated signal unit that communicates a plurality of disparate signals of an aircraft bus to and from the passenger seat via a wireless link, ..." As before, Galipeau et al. does not teach the use of a wireless link to enable the signal unit to communicate the plurality of disparate signals to and from the passenger seat, as disclosed in the subject claims. Thus, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that the rejection for this claim be withdrawn, and for claims 17-20 that depend therefrom.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Galipeau et al. fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 15 (and claims 2, 4-7, 9-14 and 17-20 which respectively depend therefrom). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

# II. Rejection of Claim 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Galipeau et al. (US Pat. No. 6,249,913 B1). Claim 16 has been canceled, as such this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

09/853,137

10194.8017.US01/CINGP113USA

#### CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [CINGP113USA].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

Eric D. Jorgenson

Reg. No. 46,002

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center 1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street Cleveland, Ohio 44114 Telephone (216) 696-8730 Facsimile (216) 696-8731